

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 16 are currently pending. Claims 1 - 2, 6, and 14 have been amended and claims 15 and 16 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for claim 15 and 16 may be found at page 3, paragraph 17 and FIG. 6 of the application as originally filed.

Claim 1 has been amended to address typographical issues and not to overcome any of the rejections of the Office Action.

The drawings were objected to as many of the figures are dark. Formal drawings are submitted for the Examiner's consideration with a letter to the Official Draftsperson. No amendments to the drawings have been made.

Claim 2 has been objected to for informalities. Claim 2 has been amended to address informalities indicated by the Examiner.

The Examiner has requested that the claim numbered 111, be renumbered as claim 11. Claim 111 has been renumbered as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter with applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claims 6 and 14 have been rejected as these claims recite the "top housing" rather than the "top interior housing." Claims 6 and 14 have been amended to address this rejection.

Claims 1 and 10 - 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Rockwell (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,692). Claims 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Rockwell. Claims 3 - 5, 8, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Rockwell and in view of Bohn (U.S. Patent No. 6,525,306).

Claim 9 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 6 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 6 and 14 have been amended to address the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

The rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed as Rockwell fails to disclose every limitation recited in claim 1. For example, Rockwell fails to disclose "a free extending button integrally formed with said top housing;" and "said top housing providing a cantilevered mounting of said extending button to said body of said device," as recited in claim 1.

Rockwell, as understood, discloses a cursor for a digitizing tablet configured to provide the feel of a mouse. The Rockwell cursor includes a front piece having cross hairs configured to be aligned with features of interest, three actuator arms configured to actuate a number of switches, and a torsion bar configured to provide a restoring force to the actuators arms when pressed. A central portion of each of the actuator arms is mounted over a vertical member of the torsion bar, such that the actuators arms are configured to rotate about the central portion when pressed. The actuator arms may be pressed in a front portion causing a forward switch to be actuated or may be pressed in a rear portion causing a rear switch to be actuated. See Rockwell at Col. 5, lines 44 - 50 and FIG. 6. Because Rockwell's actuator arms are centrally mounted on the torsion bar (see Rockwell at Col. 5, lines 23 - 29, torsion bar "support" actuator arms) and are configured to be rotated about the central portion of the arms, the actuator arms are not cantilever mounted. A cantilever is a projecting structure that is supported at one end. See, for example, the definition of cantilever in Webster's II New College Dictionary. A photocopy of the relevant dictionary pages are attached hereto in an appendix for the Examiner's convenience. Because Rockwell does not discuss actuator arms that are cantilevers, Rockwell does not disclose a "top housing providing a cantilevered mounting of said extending button to the said top housing," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Rockwell.

While the above discussion clearly distinguishes claim 1 from Rockwell, Applicants additionally note, Rockwell does not disclose "a free extending button integrally formed with said top housing," as recited in claim 1. That is, there are no structures under the free extending buttons that provide support to the buttons. Rockwell's actuator arms are not free extending but contact the torsion bar so that the torsion bar supports the actuators arms and provides a restoring force to the actuator arms when depressed. Rockwell indicates at col. 5, lines 23 - 29, that the torsion bar supports the actuator arms. Therefore, Rockwell's actuator

Appl. No. 09/978,306
Amdt. dated November 25, 2003
Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2003

PATENT

arms are not "free extending" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least this additional reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Rockwell.

Claim 14 recites limitations similar to claim 1 and is not anticipated by Rockwell for at least the same reasons as those discussed above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL
60085049 v1